

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on October 2, 2006, and the references cited therewith. Claims 1, 9, 15, 22, and 29 are amended and claims 2, 3, 5, 10, 12, 16-18, 23, 25, 26, and 30-32 are canceled. As a result, claims 1, 6-9, 13-15, 20-22, 27-29, 34 and 35 are now pending in this application.

35 USC § 112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 3, 5, 12, 25, 32 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The subject matter of dependent claims 3, 5, 12, 25 and 32 has been incorporated into the respective independent claims 1, 9, 22 and 29 and the language has been amended to correct the informalities mentioned in the Office Action. Accordingly, applicants request that this rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-18, 20, 22-23, 25-27, 29-32, and 34_ were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,898,869 to Anderson (“Anderson”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,925,099 to Futral et al. (“Futral”). Claims 8, 14, 21, 28, and 35 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Futral, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,224 to Klein (“Klein”). Applicants request reconsideration in light of the above amendments.

Applicants submit that even if the references are combined in the manner proposed in the Office Action, the combination fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed elements and limitations recited in the amended claims.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 22 recite that “one or more write bus transactions at the address translation unit” are used to load the reset vector in the registers while the core processing circuit is in the reset state. Even if one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use an address translation unit between the PCMCIA card and the host in Anderson, as asserted in the Office Action, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use the address translation unit to load a reset vector. Anderson focuses on the advantages of

using the dual-ported memory, which facilitates communication between the processor and the host and which is capable of being loaded with boot code by an attached host (see col. 2, lines 55-59 and col. 3, lines 23-25). In light of the advantages of using the dual-ported memory to load boot code from the host, applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use an address translation unit to load a reset vector in the system of Anderson, even if the address translation unit were used to provide other communications between the host and PCMCIA card.

Independent claim 1 recites a host processing system including “logic to maintain the core processing circuit in a reset state during power up of the core processing circuit.” Independent claims 9, 15, 22, and 29 similarly recite “having a host processing system maintain a core processing circuit in a reset state during power up of the core processing circuit.” As understood by applicants, the host 11 in Anderson initiates a reset using RESET line 25b (see Fig. 2; col. 5, lines 41-50). After the processor 31 enters a reset state, “[p]rocessor 31 is maintained in reset by Q output 61 of flip-flop 55 while dual-ported memory 39 (e.g., FIG. 1) is loaded with boot code for processor 31” (see col. 6, lines 1-7). Thus, the host in Anderson merely initiates the reset and does not actually maintain the processor 31 in the reset state because the flip-flop 55 on the PCMCIA card 13 performs this function.

Independent claims 1, 9, 15, 22, and 29 also recite a host processing system comprising a host bridge, which is used to fetch data or instructions from system memory in the host processing system. As understood by applicants, Anderson does not appear to disclose such a host bridge. The Office Action refers to the PCMCIA interface 17 as a host bridge. Applicants respectfully point out, however, that the PCMCIA interface 17 is located on the PCMCIA card 13 and not on the host 11. Thus, PCMCIA interface 17 is not a host bridge of a host processing system.

Because the combination of Anderson with Futral and Klein fails to identically disclose each and every element and limitation recited in amended independent claims 1, 9, 15, 22, and 29, applicants submit that these independent claims, and the claims dependent therefrom, would not have been obvious over these references. Accordingly, applicants request that the rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (603-668-6560) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2121.

Respectfully submitted,

MARK A. SCHMISSEUR

By his Representatives,

Customer Number: 45459

Telephone Number: 603-668-6560

By /Kevin J. Carroll/
Kevin J. Carroll
Reg. No. 36,384